



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/672,404	09/26/2003	Denny Jaeger	4336	9153
7590 06/22/2010				
Harris Zimmerman Law Offices of Harris Zimmerman Suite 710 1330 Broadway Oakland, CA 94612-2506			EXAMINER DHINGRA, PAWANDEEP	
			ART UNIT 2625	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 06/22/2010	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/672,404

**Applicant(s)**

JAEGER, DENNY

**Examiner**

PAWANDEEP S. DHINGRA

**Art Unit**

2625

**Period for Reply** -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 3/17/2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10, 14-28, 32-46, 50-55 and 59-67 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10, 14-28, 32-46, 50-55 and 59-67 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/18/2010
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

- This action is responsive to the following communication: Request for continued examination (RCE) filed on 3/17/2010.
- Claims 1-10, 14-28, 32-46, 50-55 and 59-67 are now pending.

#### ***Response to arguments***

Applicant's amendments, filed 3/17/2010 have been entered and fully considered. However, applicant's arguments filed 3/17/2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that none of the references teach the newly amended features of independent claims.

In reply, examiner asserts Abe in view of Winer and Abe in view of Dauerer have been shown to teach those features, please see claim rejections below.

#### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 3/17/2010 has been entered.

***Examiner Notes***

Examiner cites particular paragraphs, columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims below for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested that, in preparing responses, the applicant fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the examiner.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 20, 37 and 59-67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Abe et al., US 6,975,425 in view of Winer, US 5,796,401.

Re claim 1, Abe et al discloses a method for selectively printing graphic objects displayed on a display device (device 41, fig. 3) (see column 1, lines 25-42), said method comprising: creating a geometric object (geometric object as shown in fig. 22, note that geometric object can be of square, triangle, etc., can be made of dotted line, solid line, etc. as shown in figs. 10A, 14-15, 21), said geometric object defining an area

of said display device to be printed on a selected print medium (see column 11, line 55-column 14, line 60; figures 10, 13-15, 22-25); said geometric object being user-manipulable with respect to the size of said geometric object displayed on said display device so that said area of said displayed device to be printed can be changed medium (note that user can change the shape and re-size the geometric object to make it cover the area as desired for printing, see column 11, line 55-column 14, line 60; figures 10, 13-15, 22-25); converting said graphic objects within said geometric object to print driver data to print said graphic objects within said geometric object on said selected print medium (see column 11, line 55-column 14, line 60; figures 8-10, 13-15, 22-23, 25).

Winer teaches a geometric object (elements 46, 52, fig. 4A) being user-manipulable with respect to the size of said geometric object and the position of said geometric object displayed on said display device (note that box 46 size in terms of height, inches and spacing can be changed and it can be horizontally or vertically or centre or bottom arranged or moved via relationship schemes. Thus, box 46 can be changed based on it's size and position as displayed on a display device by a user, see figs. 4A, 5B, 6B, 9, 14 with text).

Therefore, it would have been advantageous to modify the information processing apparatus as disclosed by Abe to include the drawing objects techniques as taught by Winer for the benefit of facilitating the design of page layouts by a user as taught by Winer at column 1, lines 15-16. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention to combine the apparatus of Abe with the apparatus of Winer to reach the aforementioned advantage.

Re claim 20, Abe discloses a graphical user interface for selectively printing graphic objects displayed on a display device (see figures 3, 11; see column 11, line 55-column 14, line 60), claim 20 is essentially similar to claim 1, except it is an apparatus claim, hence arguments made for claim 1 are applicable for claim 20.

Re Claim 37, claim 37 recites identical features, as claims 1, except claims 37 merely deals with executing the method of claim 1 on a computer. Thus, arguments made for claim 1 are applicable for claim 37.

Re claim 59, Abe further discloses linking said geometric object to a canvas object (drawing area 62, fig. 3) having a surface that may be partially viewable (see figures 3, 13, 22-30 with text).

Re claim 60, Winer teaches scrolling said geometric object with contents of said canvas object when a locking feature of said geometric object is activated (see column 7, line 36-column 8, line 26, note that the objects can be moved via "once only" or "permanent" relationship schemes. Wherein when permanent is selected all the objects are moved together in unison as a group when one of the object is dragged, while when once only is selected then only the selected object moves when it is dragged, see also figs. 4-5).

Re claim 61, Winer teaches scrolling contents of said canvas object without moving said geometric object when a locking feature of said geometric object is not activated (see column 7, line 36-column 8, line 26, note that the objects can be moved via "once only" or "permanent" relationship schemes. Wherein when permanent is selected all the objects are moved together in unison as a group when one of the object

is dragged, while when once only is selected then only the selected object moves when it is dragged, see also figs. 4-5).

Re Claims 62-67 recite identical features, as claims 59-60, except claims 62-67 merely deal with executing the method of claims 59-60 on a computer. Thus, arguments made for claim 59-60 are applicable for claims 62-67.

3. Claims 1-10, 14-28, 32-46, 50-55 and 59-67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Abe et al., US 6,975,425 in view of Dauerer et al., US 5,841,435.

Re claim 1, Abe et al discloses a method for selectively printing graphic objects displayed on a display device (see column 1, lines 25-42), said method comprising: creating a geometric object (geometric object as shown in fig. 22, note that geometric object can be of square, triangle, etc., can be made of dotted line, solid line, etc. as shown in figs. 10A, 14-15, 21), said geometric object defining an area of said display device to be printed on a selected print medium (see column 11, line 55-column 14, line 60; figures 10, 13-15, 22-25); said geometric object being user-manipulable with respect to the size of said geometric object displayed on said display device so that said area of said displayed device to be printed can be changed medium (note that user can change the shape and re-size the geometric object to make it cover the area as desired for printing, see column 11, line 55-column 14, line 60; figures 10, 13-15, 22-25); converting said graphic objects within said geometric object to print driver data to print said graphic objects within said geometric object on said selected print medium (see column 11, line 55-column 14, line 60; figures 8-10, 13-15, 22-23, 25).

Dauerer teaches a geometric object (element 68 fig. 4) being user-manipulable with respect to the size of said geometric object and the position of said geometric object displayed on said display device (see figures 4-5; column 4, line 63-column 5, line 23; column 1, lines 31-34).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention to modify the information processing apparatus as disclosed by Abe to include the object manipulating techniques as taught by Dauerer for the benefit of "easily move any work onto or out of the desk pad or display without disturbing the rest of the work area" as taught by Dauerer at column 2, lines 30-33.

Re claim 2, In addition to elements disclosed related to claim 1 above, Abe further discloses wherein said converting includes converting a portion of a graphic object that is partially within said geometric object so that said portion of said graphic object is printed on said selected print medium (see figures 14-15; column 26, line 10-column 27, line 59).

Re claim 3, In addition to elements disclosed related to claim 1 above, Abe further discloses wherein said converting includes resealing said graphic objects within said geometric object such that said graphic objects within said geometric object when printed on a printable area of said selected print medium are in the same proportion to said printable area as said graphic objects displayed on said display device are to said geometric object (see column 26, line 10-column 27, line 59; column 28, lines 7-60; see figures 19, 25, 35, 42).



Re claim 4, In addition to elements disclosed related to claim 1 above, Abe further discloses changing a size of said geometric object without changing sizes of said graphic objects within said geometric object to correspondingly change said sizes of said graphic objects within said geometric object when printed on said print medium (see figure 118-119; column 75, line 15-column 76, line 21).

Re claim 5, In addition to elements disclosed related to claim 4 above, Abe further discloses wherein said changing includes changing said size of said geometric object displayed on said display device to an actual printable area size of said print medium in response to a user activation of an actual size feature of said geometric object (see figures 62-64 with corresponding text).

Re claim 6, In addition to elements disclosed related to claim 4 above, Abe further discloses wherein said changing includes diagonally moving a cursor to select the size of said geometric object (see column 11, line 55-column 14, line 60).

Re claim 7, In addition to elements disclosed related to claim 1 above, Abe further discloses moving said geometric object on said display device to define a new corresponding area of said display device to be printed (see column 11, line 55-column 14, line 60).

Re claim 8, In addition to elements disclosed related to claim 1 above, Abe further discloses deleting said geometric object by moving a cursor from one corner of said geometric object to another corner of said geometric object (see column 11, line 55-column 14, line 60; figures 14-15).

Re claim 9, In addition to elements disclosed related to claim 1 above, Abe further discloses wherein said creating includes creating an array of geometric objects, each of said geometric objects of said array representing a printable area of print media (see column 11, line 55-column 14, line 60).

Re claim 10, In addition to elements disclosed related to claim 1 above, Abe further discloses converting said geometric object into an array of geometric objects in response to a multiple page feature of said geometric object, each of said geometric objects of said array representing a printable area of print media (see figures 52-55; column 46, line 31-column 48, line 28).

Re claim 14, Abe further discloses wherein said creating includes creating an array of geometric objects on said surface of said canvas object, each of said geometric objects of said array representing a printable area of print media (see column 11, line 55-column 14, line 60; figures 62-64 with corresponding text).

Re claim 15, Abe further discloses converting said geometric object into an array of geometric objects on said surface of said canvas object, each of said geometric objects of said array representing a printable area of print media (see column 11, line 55-column 14, line 60; figures 62-64 with corresponding text).

Re claim 16, Abe further discloses changing sizes of said geometric objects of said array displayed on said display device without changing a size of any content in said canvas object (see figure 118-119; column 75, line 15-column 76, line 21).

Re claim 17, Abe further discloses wherein said changing includes changing said sizes of said geometric objects of said array displayed on said display device to actual printable area sizes of print media in response to a user activation of an actual size feature of said array of geometric objects (see figures 62-64 with corresponding text).

Re claim 18, Abe further discloses changing a width size of said canvas object to equal a width size of said geometric object in response to a user activation of a snap to feature (see figure 25; column 33, line 50-column 34, line 22).

Re claim 19, Abe further discloses selecting some of said geometric objects of said array in an order to define a printing sequence for at least some of said geometric objects (see figures 62-64 with corresponding text).

Re claim 20, Abe discloses a graphical user interface for selectively printing graphic objects displayed on a display device (see figures 3, 11; see column 11, line 55-column 14, line 60), claim 20 is essentially similar to claim 1, except it is an apparatus claim, hence arguments made for claim 1 are applicable for claim 20.

Re claim 21, claim 21 recites identical features, and is essentially similar to claim 2. Thus, arguments made for claim 2 are applicable for claim 21.

Re claims 22-28 and 32-36, claims 22-28 and 32-36 recite identical features, and are essentially similar to claims 4-10 and 14-18, respectively. Thus, arguments made for claims 4-10 and 14-18 are applicable for claims 22-28 and 32-36.

Re Claims 37-46 and 50-55, claims 37-46 and 50-55 recite identical features, as claims 1-10 and 14-19, except claims 37-46 and 50-55 merely deal with executing the method of claims 1-10 and 14-19 on a computer. Thus, arguments made for claim 1-10 and 14-19 are applicable for claims 37-46 and 50-55.

Re claim 59, Abe further discloses linking said geometric object to a canvas object (drawing area 62, fig. 3) having a surface that may be partially viewable (see figures 3, 13, 22-30 with text).

Dauerer also teaches linking geometric object to a canvas object (element 52, fig. 4-5) having a surface that may be partially viewable (see figures 4-5; column 4, line 63-column 5, line 23; column 1, lines 31-34).

Re claim 60, Dauerer teaches scrolling said geometric object with contents of said canvas object when a locking feature of said geometric object is activated (see figures 4-5, 9-11; column 4, line 63-column 6, line 40; column 9, lines 58-65, note that when locking feature of display function is activated, the locked portions of display does not move or are displayed).

Re claim 61, Dauerer teaches scrolling contents of said canvas object without moving said geometric object when a locking feature of said geometric object is not activated (see figures 4-5, 9-11; column 4, line 63-column 6, line 40; column 9, lines 58-65, note that when locking feature of display function is not activated, other element of area 52 can be moved without moving element 68).

Re Claims 62-67 recite identical features, as claims 59-60, except claims 62-67 merely deal with executing the method of claims 59-60 on a computer. Thus, arguments made for claim 59-60 are applicable for claims 62-67.

***Contact Information***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to PAWANDEEP S. DHINGRA whose telephone number is (571)270-1231. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 9:30-7:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David K. Moore can be reached on (571) 272-7437. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/P. D./  
Examiner, Art Unit 2625

***/David K Moore/***

***Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625***